

# **The Rockefeller Foundation Turns to the East: Polish Social Sciences Fellows during the Interwar Period**

By Morgane Labbé

Assistant Professor  
Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales  
Paris, France

[labbe@ehess.fr](mailto:labbe@ehess.fr)

© 2011 by Morgane Labbé

The Rockefeller Foundation's (RF) social sciences fellowship program in Eastern Europe has been ignored by scholars largely because, from a quantitative and financial point of view, the program was a minor part of the RF's broader scientific policy. Yet, by addressing from a peripheral setting such crucial issues as the training and circulation of scientific elites, the rise of expert-knowledge, or the relations between science and politics in the interwar period, one gains relevant insight into the RF's policy to promote transnational scientific networks and the circulation of knowledge. In this respect Eastern Europe challenges conclusions that resulted from the limited study of the programs carried out only in Western Europe. Therefore Poland is an appropriate case study.

In Poland the RF intervened in a former multicultural space alive with national traditions. The new state not only gathered former elites from its German, Austrian and Russian parts, but also from the diaspora, mainly France and England. These elites carried with them different intellectual and local traditions, as they moved within diverse locations. Cosmopolitanism and nationalism crossed each other continuously at all levels. Individuals could, on the one hand, support the building of their national state, yet on the other hand could be ready to emigrate due to economic and political hardships.

How did the RF's programs and policies cope with a non-unified unstable cultural and political space where elites were involved so forcefully in the issue of "modernity?" My

account concerns the RF fellowship program and presents a biographical study of one generation of Polish fellows that was supported by RF grants for barely two decades. Yet this micro-level study addresses central features of the RF's scientific policy, both in terms of trajectory as well as in terms of the interactive dimensions of this policy.

The RF fellowship program in the Polish social sciences started quite late (1929) and ended in 1939 with the Nazi and Soviet occupations. As in other countries, social science was not a substantial part of the RF's overall fellowship program. Only 35 Polish scholars were awarded fellowships.<sup>1</sup> These fellows were not registered in the RF's Directory of Fellowships, but it is through a single list made in 1943 that gathered news on the wartime situations of the European fellows,<sup>2</sup> that gives evidence of them. The existing Fellowship Recorder Cards summarize information extracted from the discarded files and provide particular information on the experiences (date, country, recommendations, assessment, etc.) of the fellows.

The archival material is therefore essential both as a source and as evidence. Other non-Rockefeller archival collections also document the program. Once the fellows were identified, a search in Polish archives and libraries brought forth complementary information, particularly correspondence.<sup>3</sup> The aim of my current research is to create a database that presents, in a comparative and global perspective, the effects of the fellowship program on the professional trajectory of the elites, their networks and interactions.<sup>4</sup> To reconstruct their biographies, which are marked by uncertain and complex trajectories, results in methodological problems that will not be addressed in this report, which will offer only a descriptive account of the fellowship program in Poland.

### **1) Who were the Thirty-five Polish Fellows?**

Not surprisingly the fellows were predominantly male, only four women were fellows. Their ages ranged from twenty-three to forty-seven years old<sup>5</sup> and the modal and median ages

of thirty revealed that recruitment of the fellows came mostly from among established scholars. The fact that ten fellows were more than thirty-five years old indicates that the program was opened to senior academics as well, even if it was not the rule.

This recruitment trend is specifically confirmed by when the fellowship occurred in the academic trajectory of the fellow. Since the majority of the fellows earned a Ph.D.,<sup>6</sup> only the interval between both dates—receipt of the Ph.D. and awarding of the fellowship—could be calculated. For nearly a third of the fellows, the fellowship occurred two years after the Ph.D. Three additional fellows completed their Ph.D. during the fellowship, and fourteen fellows under the age of the thirty-five could be considered at the beginning of their careers. The records show that a fellowship was given to one in two scholars within five years of completing the Ph.D. The dual nature of the fellowship program is evident here. The program targeted promising junior scholars by funding supplementary training beyond the Ph.D. and at the same time turned to senior and established scholars, and enabled them to become mediators and thereby consolidate their academic positions.

Generally speaking the fellowship was for one year, but extensions and renewals<sup>7</sup> were frequent, and the average duration was eighteen months. The distribution was bimodal and an equal number of one and two year fellowships were awarded. A noticeable result was that more than half of the fellows (nineteen) received, with durations of up to one year, a fellowship extension. These examples attest to the RF's positive support of the Polish program, a fact also confirmed by the commentaries found in the fellowship files.

#### **a) From Fellowship to Grant-In-Aid**

The archival material also documents the RF's continued financial support of outstanding fellows beyond the extension of their fellowship. Five fellows were allocated grants-in-aid to conduct further research either abroad or in Poland. For example, Wincenty Stys received two fellowships (1933 and 1934) that funded his residence in Germany and England while he

undertook his research on the economic history of the industrialization of rural European countries. When he returned to the University of Lwow he found himself “unable to complete his dissertation for qualification as Dozent due to [the] quantity of material and unless [a] grant is made S[tys] will have to take [a] position in [a] Secondary school to supplement [his] salary.”<sup>8</sup>

Tracy Kittredge, an RF representative in Paris, reviewed the professional quality of Stys' work and recommended the possibility of a “research aid grant” that would give him the opportunity to achieve his research goals. Both a grant and a renewal would be awarded. The RF's decision was based on the excellence of Stys' fellowship work, but equally important was the potential of Stys' professional integration, of which the RF had evidence. We have definite assurances that, on the completion of his dissertation, Dr. Stys will be appointed to a university position as lecturer in economics. It is probable also that in the course of a relatively few years he will succeed to the professorship that will become vacant in 1936 through the retirement of Professor Grabski.<sup>9</sup>

In the fall of 1933 similar circumstances befell Stanislas Klimek, a young anthropologist on a second fellowship with A. L. Kroeber at the University of California, Berkeley. The next year he found himself without any possibility of a renewal. Kroeber turned to the RF on behalf of Klimek. Stacy May of the RF reported that K. has become increasingly interested in Klimek's work and has arranged field studies for him among the Indian tribes of California that have proved so overwhelmingly successful that Pr Kroeber has himself appealed to the RF for further assistance to Klimek.<sup>10</sup>

A financial solution was found in September 1934 when Kroeber received from the Institute of Social Sciences, “\$1000 for salary for K to enable him to extend his present work for 10 months.” In addition the RF gave “a grand-in-aid of \$800 equivalent to two months

extension of present fellowship.”<sup>11</sup> In Klimek’s case, as in others, the RF coordinated its aid with that of other institutions.

The goal for the eventual integration of former RF fellows in their native country led the RF to select young scholars they viewed as the future successors of their professors. The RF remained in close touch with the fellows through visits made by its officers. In 1931 Kittredge traveled in Poland to meet with authorities at various universities. In his conversations with prominent professors he invited them to recommend their best assistants for fellowships.<sup>12</sup> When the proposal of a grant for Klimek was at issue, Kittredge was aware of Klimek’s situation and he mentioned that Klimek “will probably succeed to prof[essor] Czekanowski’s double chair of anthropology and ethnology.”<sup>13</sup> Similarly, Stys was viewed as the successor of professor Grabski,<sup>14</sup> Chalasinski would succeed Znaniecki, and Serejski would replace Handelsmann.

By contrast, the fellows returning to Poland who lacked institutional integration and support faced a precarious situation. For example, although the psychologist Zawadzki received two fellowships and had worked with Bühler and Lazarsfeld in Vienna and the U.S., when he was back in Poland in 1936 the RF noted that he “has not as yet completed the manuscript of his dissertation for the dozentship hence he cannot receive a stable university appointment until this requirement has been met” and has only found a “a temporary appointment as lecturer in Psychology at [the] University of Wilno.”<sup>15</sup> His situation worsened in 1939. His subsequent exile to the U.S. broke his tenuous link with Polish academic institutions and after 1945 he did not return to Poland.<sup>16</sup>

#### **b) Fellows without Typology**

The RF’s ability and willingness to adapt to local and individual situations is a feature of its fellowship policy, and is also seen in the varied characteristics of where fellows stayed.<sup>17</sup> At first glance, however, the wide variety of stays seems to resist any typological

description, and statistical counting goes against this heterogeneity. Stays in a single place were infrequent and only concerned six fellowships. At the other extreme are the stays of the senior fellows—professors, directors of institutes—that included a circuit among many institutions where they held conferences and met colleagues. Of course, various combinations are also found, i.e., a fellow would spend several months in one principal place before travelling to a few other universities, or perhaps a fellowship would consist of a succession of stays of differing lengths (days, weeks or months) at a number of individual institutions.

The fellowship of Joseph Chałasinski, a sociologist at the University of Poznan is an interesting case. Chalasinski arrived in the U.S. in September 1931 and spent his first six months in New York City. After a month in Philadelphia, he stayed a year in Chicago where he worked in the Department of Parks and Burgess, as he had primarily wished. He returned to New York City via Detroit and also stopped in Washington where he worked for two months in the Library of Congress. Back in New York City he embarked for Europe but again stopped in England prior to his return to Poland.<sup>18</sup>

Using a typology to summarize and analyse the fellowship experiences would suggest the existence of a model that shaped them. The notes contained in the RF Fellowship Recorder Cards (RF Record Group 10.2), albeit abbreviated, demonstrate that the RF officers did not manage their fellowship program in accordance with a model, but did so through consultation and progressive adjustments to the particular situations, constraints and preferences that arose.

Another example is Stanislaw Hubert,<sup>19</sup> a fellow in international relations who arrived in October 1935 at Yale University and for eight months worked with Professor Nicholas Spykman in the Department of International Relations. Spykman was very satisfied with the work of Hubert, and already in a March 1936 meeting with the RF's Stacy May

recommended a new schedule for Hubert so, “that H visit Chicago and .... that he spend [the] months of May and June in Wash[ington]. And July at the summer institute held at the University of Virginia.” But a further schedule change occurred in April, when Spykman informed May that Quincy Wright, a professor in international law at the University of Chicago whom he contacted for Hubert, suggested that Hubert come later in June and July “when the Harris Foundation Institute will be in progress.” Spykman added, “if H. would like to attend [the] Virginia Institute in addition to one in Chicago, he could reach Charlottesville in time to participate in most of the sessions, which begin on 7/5/36.” Hubert, on the recommendation of Spykman, also wrote May seeking his agreement for an earlier trip to Washington, in April and not in May, so that Hubert could “attend the annual meetings of the American Society of International Law.” It is clear that an individual fellowship program was built up through a continuous process of interaction between the fellows and the RF officers.

Individual shortcomings also led to reorientations within the ongoing program, as in the case of Mochnacka. Edith Abbott, a dean at the University of Chicago wrote Stacy May that “M. has been very unhappy and discouraged and has had an unfortunate experience,” and therefore recommended that Mochnacka move from Chicago to Berkeley.<sup>20</sup>

Other fellowship venues were altered for professional reasons. “It is probable that Kalecki will have to interrupt his fellowship work from time to time in order to return to Warsaw at intervals of from three to four months to take a share in current work of the Business Cycle Institute there.”<sup>21</sup> Kalecki’s breaks were frequent but were integrated in the management of the fellowship through an extension of the fellowship’s tenure. The RF was always careful not to impede the career of a fellow and sought to promote his success after his return. This pragmatism allowed exceptions to the general fellowship rules. Kalecki, regarded as a first-rank economist, is an example. “Despite the uncertainty regarding K’s immediate future in Poland, JVS has approved seven months extension because he is

convinced that K is exceptionally gifted and is destined to make a name for himself in his field.”<sup>22</sup>

Much information regarding the RF fellowship program can be gathered from Kittredge’s notes of meetings, talks, travels, and assessments. These writings indicate that the RF managed its programs at a distance as a field of experimentation within a vast world laboratory of circulating fellows, and not so much as an application of a controlled and centralized program.

The structure of individual fellowships varied according to the fellow’s discipline. Types of activities included the collection of data in libraries for an historian; field-work in the Rocky Mountains or in the Chicago suburbs for ethnologists and sociologists; and conferences for economists, etc. This variety correlated with the institutions where they worked, which were far from being exclusively scholarly. Several fellows were in governmental agencies or local public services/bureaus, such as the Brookings Institute in Washington, the town planning department of the City of Rotterdam, and the International Institute of Agriculture in Rome. This diversity reflects the RF’s strategy to create a widespread range to its fellowship program.

The list of the countries visited by the fellows gives us a partial and imperfect picture regarding mobility among fellows. The majority of fellows visited several countries, but only eight fellows stayed in one country (limited information is available because of the different sizes of the countries). Counting the countries considered the principal place of the stay (measured by fellowship duration), does not clarify the individual experience, but speaks much of geographical attraction.

At the top of the range was the U.S., a destination for nearly a third of the fellows. When combined the European countries remained predominant, in particular because of the attraction of Germany and Austria. These results, though general, give evidence of the



continued relevance of central Europe for the Polish scholars. This historical trend persisted in spite of the growing attraction of the Anglo-Saxon world, and is perhaps a generational effect due to senior fellows who previously studied in German and Austrian universities. The role of France as a RF destination appears to be minor particularly in light of its traditional influence on the Polish intelligentsia. The reason is twofold: it is as much a result of the RF's intention to re-orientate the fellows to the Anglo-Saxon world as well as a consequence of the strategy of local authorities. In a 1931 travel report from Poland the RF's Kittredge stated

In the opinion of the Professors at Lwow, the R.F. Fellowships, because of the unusual opportunities they afford, should be reserved . . . largely for study in the U.S. The Polish Government already provides facilities for study in Europe . . . E. sends three or four of his students each year to study in France, Italy Germany and England for short period.<sup>23</sup>

Later, in subsequent research, circulation of fellows will be described and formalized at the local level, i.e., their institutes, university departments, and bureaus. This analysis will capture how RF policy promoted the development of transnational networks that relied on established institutions that helped connect fellows from different countries and disciplines.

## **2) How the RF Reshaped the Polish Social Sciences**

Geographical mobility is one of the vectors in the circulation of knowledge. What makes it effective are the institutions and the disciplinary spaces that encompass it. The goal of the RF fellowship program was to promote this circulation between Polish intellectuals. The 1943 list of European fellowships provides for each fellow their discipline, specialty or field as assigned by the RF program. An analysis of the list shows ten disciplinary specialties that can be compared to the discipline in which the scholar was trained, generally speaking their Ph.D. field. Although the chart below is a basic comparison of two denominations, the differences displayed are quite instructive and could be interpreted as an indicator of the disciplinary interests of the RF.

<b>Discipline (according to Ph.D.)</b>		<b>Discipline (according to the RF)</b>	
Economics	9	Economics	11
Law	8	Sociology	6
Sociology	2	Anthropology	3
History	3	Psychology	3
Linguistics	2	Criminology	3
Psychology	2	Int. Rel/ Pol. sc sc.	3
Ethnology	3	Social Security	2
Mathematics	1	History	1
		Geography	1
		Social Welfare	1

The RF's list reveals two disciplinary poles. On the one end is the predominant place of economics and then sociology-anthropology. At the other end, the minor role of history and the striking absence of law and philosophy are to be noted. The RF also used terms that referred to specialties whose disciplinary identities were less defined, such as "criminology" or "social security."

In comparing the disciplines of training with the disciplines of the RF, the results are striking, in particular for law. These fellows were actually orientated to such specialties as criminology, international relations, political sciences, and even economics. Law was a leading and primary discipline in the general curriculum of students in the "humanities." Perhaps it was preferred by the RF officers who considered it more suitable than philosophy, for instance, in order to prepare scholars for an applied social sciences field. This assumption is confirmed by the important RF support given to the Institute of Constitutional and International Law at the University of Lwow,<sup>24</sup> where not only jurists but also economists, historians, and demographers jointly tackled contemporary issues.

Here Kittredge's opinion of law as a valuable academic discipline differed with the view of the Polish authorities.

The majority of the professors of the Law Faculty at Cracow are opposed to the establishment of an Economic and Political Section, or to the creation of a separate Faculty. The greater part of the students are preparing themselves for government service. For this the legal training is considered indispensable.<sup>25</sup>

Economics, a curriculum equally as important as law, but unlike law was acknowledged as a discipline by the RF, attracted scholars trained in many fields. While important in the RF's program, sociology played a minor role in the training of Polish fellows, in part a consequence of sociology's new place in Polish universities. The Polish scholars deemed as sociologists by the RF were often trained in others fields such as history, linguistics, or social economics.

The RF hoped to reshape the social sciences in Europe. The goal was not to create a unique discipline of "social sciences" with clear boundaries, but rather to let various configurations emerge. This would be done by supporting a new discipline or specialty in the case of sociology or criminology; or through promoting interdisciplinary relations between existing sciences such as law, economics, and psychology; or by gathering sciences around transversal topics rather than social issues such as delinquency, social welfare, and cultural personality.

### **3) The RF Fellowship Program and Political Upheavals**

It is important to note that political upheavals and wars altered the RF's fellowship program and the trajectories of its fellows. The return of a fellow to his homeland and the promise of his re-incorporation into an institution were important axioms of the fellowship program, however, both internal political events (the authoritarian shift of the government, nationalist conflicts, anti-Semitism) and international factors (war, Nazi and Soviet occupation), undermined the RF's policies.

Already in the 1930s the RF faced tensions between the Polish government and Polish economic scholars. The Cracow Institute of Economics was created in 1934 by the Polish Academy of Sciences after the suppression of the economics professorship in economics at the University of Cracow. Adam Heydel who had held the professorship headed the Institute and along with other members received a salary and fellowship from the RF.<sup>26</sup> The Business

Cycle Institute in Warsaw was entangled in similar political problems. Its director, Edward Lipinski, and the other economists working there, either were forced to resign or were dismissed. Lipinski and Kalecki received RF fellowships for what the RF considered a period of temporary leave. The RF attempted to avoid the conflict and tried to maintain a cordial relationship, all the while hoping for a solution.

By 1938 international events forced the RF to reevaluate the future of its European programs. Returning from Poland Kittredge reported that Polish professors drew his attention to their project of “the creation of a Center of International, Political and Economic Studies in Warsaw” which would be endowed with a political mission, and therefore function as “a center of crystallization for the increasing resistance in Eastern Europe at being incorporated in either the Berlin or Moscow system.”<sup>27</sup> Because of the war the proposal was not formally submitted.

War and the resultant occupations altered the RF’s program in Poland as it did everywhere in Eastern and Central Europe. Intellectual and scientific elites were condemned to deportation and execution; clandestine activities and exile served as ways to escape. Faced with the dire destiny of its fellows, RF policy followed a variety of paths. Because of its transnational networks, its financial and political power, and its link to institutions, the RF played a significant role in supporting these intellectuals. That the RF was continuously called upon for assistance is demonstrated by the voluminous correspondence that exists for this period.

The well-known Refugee Scholar Program<sup>28</sup> supported only one Polish social science fellow; Michael Heilperin, an economist at Hamilton College.<sup>29</sup> The support for those regarded as “exiles” was much larger.<sup>30</sup> The economic crisis and political polarization of the 1930s had already increased the demand for help, but since the war the claims intensified and the search for information on the fellows was widespread.

### **a) An Interwar Generation in the Postwar, 1945-1948**

The study of the immediate postwar years, though a short period, is crucial in order to capture the scale and the long-term influence of the RF fellowship program: was it valorized or on the contrary withdrawn, were relations abroad maintained, and how far did they help support Polish scholars? The fate of the interwar fellows can be learned from the information found on the Fellowship Recorder Cards.

Of the thirty-five fellows, twenty-five were alive in 1945. One fellow in three was a victim of the same tragic circumstances of war, mass deportation, and extermination camps as were millions of other Polish citizens. The post-1945 survivors were confronted and motivated by many challenges such as state reconstruction; the political ambivalence between socialism and loyalty to Polish patriotism; and the desire for a better life and protection against persecution for oneself and ones relatives.

Information on twenty-three of twenty-five former fellows is available for 1945-1946. A large majority (twenty) was working for a Polish institution and fifteen were in Poland. Regardless of their country of residence, fifteen pursued an academic career field, while eight chose a governmental agency, in particular diplomatic and international organizations. The situation of the former fellows during this period, like that of all Polish elites, remained unstable, and was characterized by considerable geographical and professional mobility due to political, economical and professional factors.

The further collection in Poland of additional biographical data will supplement the facts already gathered for the Interwar period. The RAC documents, however, give first insight on the critical chronological period when the break between the RF and the new communist regime occurred. These documents locate the actors in the situation and draw a more nuanced picture of the RF's position during 1945-1948 and reveal the RF's attempts to continue programs, contacts and visits<sup>31</sup> despite the political change. Yearly visits by RF

officers occurred at least until 1948. These activities were quickly politicized and undermined by suspicion and a lack of trust.

For the RF, maintaining contact with former fellows was an essential means to assess the efficiency of the program as well as to have mediators that could assure its continuity. In the confused political situation that followed the liberation of Poland, continuity was central as the RF resumed its programs that were interwoven with relief and reconstruction purposes in the devastated country.<sup>32</sup> RF actions were based on previous visits by RF officers and the advice of trustworthy mediators in the new political regime. Therefore former fellows were important relays and contacts. Those having a governmental appointment were of particularly great value, i.e., Tadeusz Zebrowski in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

According to comments from Mr. Keith (U.S. Concillor in W), as well as from several other people, including Professor Kacprzak, head of hygiene, and Minister of Health Litwin, Dr. Z. is today an important figure in the government and has unusual influence. Intellectually he seems to jump ahead of the Prime Minister, whom I met while on my visit to Gdansk, and who is also obviously keener than either the Minister of Health or the Minister of Education, whom I likewise met.<sup>33</sup>

Demands for resuming RF programs came from the Polish side too. State agencies linked it with financial support for reconstruction projects, while the demand from former fellows for fellowships renewals and visits abroad was much more personal as shown in a letter to the RF from Hoszowski.

I had to leave Lwow (...) and remove to another place in western Poland—Torun. In this way I have lost my work-equipment: the library of the Institute. Now in other Polish libraries I can find only a small fraction of the books I want. So, the only way to finish my work on Business Fluctuations in England is to go to England or American and make there use of libraries. I wonder if it will be possible in the nearer future to get a help from the RF in this matter.<sup>34</sup>

The Foundation replied,

At the present time the Foundation has not yet resumed its fellowship program for your country. This will necessarily await the visit of a social science representative. We shall be glad, however, to keep your name on file and when our representative visits Poland he will try to see you.<sup>35</sup>

Soon the demands on the RF echoed the new political situation in Poland. In January 1948 Kittredge wrote to Janet Paine urging fellowship support for Waligorski who was in England without any prospect of a position. He “is probably *persona non grata* with the present communist dominated Polish government. Anyhow he doesn’t feel he can return.”<sup>36</sup>

Paine’s reply was not encouraging. “Unfortunately there have been in the past few months so many of our former fellows who are in similar positions that we have quite a roster of political refugees to propose to persons looking for Social Scientists for academic jobs.”<sup>37</sup>

International geopolitical tensions eventually forced the RF to withdraw from Eastern Europe. In Poland the change was also noticeable at the individual level. At first RF officers had relied upon former fellows holding state positions as trustworthy mediators, but soon reversed their opinion. In 1946 and 1947, Willits, reported that “Dr. Zebrowski made an excellent impression ... [and] expressed his personal gratitude for RF aid in the past,”<sup>38</sup> but a letter written in 1948 stated “Z was one of the most violent anti-American persons in the government and that his appointment as an RF fellow had certainly been a mistake.”<sup>39</sup>

## **Conclusion**

This research report is far from being a comprehensive account of my archival work at the RAC and the numerous questions it raised. Nevertheless these first results which focus on the fellows, their features and experiences are critical, because they challenge some self-evident misconceptions often associated with the RF’s history. From the RF perspective, its social science program was less a planned project of the transfer of a model or norms based on a set of rules, but rather a reaction to the interactions and professional circulation among Polish intellectuals. The issues faced by the RF led to various configurations of the program that crossed disciplines, topics and shared political values. For the fellows, mobility was not a single sequential trajectory but a fluid cultural, professional and political relationship in a space with changeable boundaries. What eventually made the fellowship program meaningful

was the individual experience of all persons involved in it and their self confidence with the axioms of the RF as manifested through various activities of scientific knowledge.

---

*Editor's Note:* This research report is presented here with the author's permission but should not be cited or quoted without the author's consent.

Rockefeller Archive Center Research Reports Online is a periodic publication of the Rockefeller Archive Center. Edited by Erwin Levold, Research Reports Online is intended to foster the network of scholarship in the history of philanthropy and to highlight the diverse range of materials and subjects covered in the collections at the Rockefeller Archive Center. The reports are drawn from essays submitted by researchers who have visited the Archive Center, many of whom have received grants from the Archive Center to support their research.

The ideas and opinions expressed in this report are those of the author and are not intended to represent the Rockefeller Archive Center.

## ENDNOTES:

<sup>1</sup> RF Annual Reports and the Statistical Summary of Fellowships 1915-1945.

<sup>2</sup> European Fellowship 1917-1943, Box 43, Folder 319, Series 100, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives (RFA), RAC.

<sup>3</sup> Mainly the Archives of the Polish Academy of Sciences in Warsaw (Archiwum Polskiej Akademii Nauk w Warszawie) and in Cracow (Archiwum Nauki PAN i PAU w Krakowie). The main comprehensive and recent biographical work is: W. Winclawski, editor, *The Biographical Dictionary of the Polish Sociology (Słownik biograficzny socjologii polskiej)*, Torun-Warszawa: Wydaw. Naukowe PWN, 3 t., 2001, 2004, 2007.

<sup>4</sup> Within the framework of a larger research program conducted by Ludovic Tournès (University Paris X), and Michael Werner (EHESS) in France.

<sup>5</sup> The ages were calculated from the birth date and the date of "First Stipend," that is, the effective start of the fellowship as registered in the Fellowship Cards.

<sup>6</sup> The information, though mentioned on the Fellowship Card, was found in Polish biographical sources, where it was more reliable and detailed.

<sup>7</sup> Mentioned in the Fellowship Cards. In the case of a second fellowship, another card was created.

<sup>8</sup> Kittredge, June 14, 1935, "W. Styś," Fellowship Recorder Cards, RG 10.2, RFA, RAC.

<sup>9</sup> Kittredge, 1934, Folder 70, Box 6, Series 789 S, RG 1.1, RFA, RAC.

<sup>10</sup> S. May, November 16, 1934, "Klimek," Fellowship Recorder Cards, RG 10.2, RFA, RAC.

<sup>11</sup> Kroeber to S. May, September 4, 1934, "Klimek," Fellowship Recorder Cards, RG 10.2, RFA, RAC.

<sup>12</sup> Kittredge, "Memorandum: On Social Sciences in Poland," May 12, 1931, Folder 526, Box 64, Series 789 S, RG 2, RFA, RAC.

<sup>13</sup> S. May, November 15, 1933, "Klimek," Fellowship Recorder Cards, RG 10.2, RFA, RAC.

<sup>14</sup> Kittredge, September 14, 1934, Folder 848, Box 110, Series 789 S, RG 2, RFA, RAC.

<sup>15</sup> Kittredge, April 4, 1936, "Zawadzki," Fellowship Recorder Cards, RG 10.2, RFA, RAC.

<sup>16</sup> "Zawadzki," Fellowship Recorder Cards, RG 10.2, RFA, RAC. See also Winclawski, op. cit.

<sup>17</sup> The Fellowship Cards registered all the places visited, even if for only a couple of days.

<sup>18</sup> "Chalasiniski," Fellowship Recorder Cards, RG 10.2, RFA, RAC.



- 
- <sup>19</sup> “Hubert,” Fellowship Recorder Cards, RG 10.2, RFA, RAC.
- <sup>20</sup> Abott to May, December 22, 1933, “Mochnacka,” Fellowship Recorder Cards, RG 10.2, RFA, RAC.
- <sup>21</sup> Fellowship program, “Kalecki,” Fellowship Recorder Cards, RG 10.2, RFA, RAC.
- <sup>22</sup> J. Van Sickle to S. H. Walker, June 3, 1937, “Kalecki,” Fellowship Recorder Cards, RG 10.2, RFA, RAC.
- <sup>23</sup> Kittredge, “Memorandum: On Social Sciences in Poland,” p. 16, May 12, 1931, Folder 526, Box 64, Series 789 S, RG 2, RFA, RAC.
- <sup>24</sup> There is voluminous documentation in the RAC on the Institute for Constitutional and International Law at the Lwow University during the period of 1931 to 1940, Folders 67, 68, and 69, Box 5, Series 789 S, RG 1.1, RFA, RAC. See also the work of A. Witczak Haugstad, with E. Ingerbrigsten, “National Policies and International Philanthropy: The Rockefeller Foundation and Polish and Hungarian Science between the World Wars,” in G. Gemelli and R. MacLeod, editors, *American Foundations in Europe*, 2003.
- <sup>25</sup> Diary T. B. Kittredge, “Memorandum,” J. Van Sickle Diary, December 1, 1931, Box 482, RG 12, RFA, RAC.
- <sup>26</sup> Polish Academy of Sciences Economic Institute, 1934, Folder 71, Box 6, Series 789 S, RG 1.1, RFA, RAC.
- <sup>27</sup> Kittredge, 1938, pp. 3-4, Folder 1223, Box 168, Series, 789 S, RFA, RAC.
- <sup>28</sup> The Rockefeller Foundation’s Refugee Scholar Program, Refugee Scholars Aided, 1933-1945, RAC, <http://www.rockarch.org/collections/rf/refugee2.php>.
- <sup>29</sup> W. H. Cowley to Kittredge, July 3, 1941, Folder 4040, Box 339, Series 200 S, GR 1.1, RFA, RAC.
- <sup>30</sup> “Polish exiles,” 1940, Folders 1443 and 1444, Box 204, Series 789 S-E, RFA, RAC. See also the correspondence between Kittredge and the Polish Coordinating Committee of the ISC in 1939 and 1940, Kittredge, Box 40, Series 1.1, RG 6.1, RFA, RAC.
- <sup>31</sup> Concerning the new visits of the officers in 1946 and 1947: Excerpt from Kittredge to JHW, July 9, 1946, Folder 2378, Box 351, Series 789 SE, RG 2, RFA, RAC. Diary NSB, Folder 2638, Box 351, Series 789 SE, RG 2, RFA, RAC.
- <sup>32</sup> See for instance the demand for book purchases of the Committee for the Rehabilitation of Polish Science and Culture, 1946-1947, 1949, Folder 59, Box 5, Series 789 S, RG 1.1, RFA, RAC.
- <sup>33</sup> O’Brien to Willits, October 25, 1946, Folder 2378, Box 351, Series 789 S-E, RG 2, RFA, RAC.
- <sup>34</sup> Hoszowski to RF, June 28, 1946, Folder 2378, Box 351, Series 789 S-E, RG 2, RFA, RAC.
- <sup>35</sup> Willits to Hoszowski, July 25, 1946, Folder 2378, Box 351, Series 789 S-E, RG 2, RFA, RAC.
- <sup>36</sup> Kittredge to Janet M. Paine, January 13, 1948, Folder 2898, Box 430, Series 789 S-E, RG 2, RFA, RAC.
- <sup>37</sup> Janet M. Paine to Kittredge, January 16, 1948, Folder 2898, Box 430, Series 789 S-E, RG 2, RFA, RAC.
- <sup>38</sup> O’Brien Willits, October 25, 1946, Folder 2378, Box 351, Series 789 S-E, RG 2, RFA, RAC.
- <sup>39</sup> EFD, May 22, 1948, Folder 2898, Box 430, Series 789 S-E, RG 2, RFA, RAC.